REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Drawings Objection

The Examiner objected to the drawings on the grounds that FIG. 10 in the Drawings referred to a "block 254" whereas the Specification referred to "block 255". (Office Action, pg. 2) Applicants amended the Specification to change "block 255" to block 254" because the disclosure in the Specification associated with "block 255" corresponds to the content of block 254 in the Drawings.

Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the Drawings because the amendment makes the numbering in the Specification consistent with that in the FIG. 10.

2. Amended Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner rejected claims 11-20 as directed to non- statutory subject matter because the claims are not limited to statutory embodiments. (Office Action, pg. 3) To overcome this rejection, Applicants amended claims 11, 13, 14, 18, and 20 to remove the "means" language, and amended independent claim 11 to recite "a processor" and "a computer readable medium including a file viewer executed by the processor" to perform the claimed operations. These added requirements are disclosed on at least paras. 7, 8, 18-19, 23, and 29 and FIGs. 1, 9, 10, and 11 of the Specification.

Applicants submit that adding the processor and computer readable medium provides the statutory material the Examiner requested and thus overcomes the Section 101 rejection.

3. Claims 1-5, 8-9, 11-14, 21-25, and 28-39 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 8-9, 11-14, 21-25, and 28-39 as anticipated (35 U.S.C. §102(e)) by Moehrle (U.S. Patent No. 7,216,301). Applicants traverse.

Claims 1, 11, and 21 require rendering a display of at least one data set name, wherein each data set is associated with one or more file components; receiving selection of one displayed data set name; displaying names of the file components associated with the selected data set; receiving selection of at least one of the displayed file component names; and rendering the selected data set name and selected at least one selected file component name in a history

panel, wherein the selected data set name and selected at least one file component are displayed in a hierarchical tree arrangement.

The Examiner cited FIG. 4A, element 102 and FIG. 4B, elements 10b-10d of Moehrle as disclosing the claim requirement of rendering a display of at least one data set name, wherein each data set is associated with one or more file components. (Office Action, pg. 4) Applicants traverse.

The cited FIG. 4A, element 102 provides an initial view of an active path having a single active link. Moehrle defines an active path as a sequence of active links as items, where an active link provides direct access to a function corresponding level or menu item without the need to navigate using a GUI. (Moehrle, col. 2, lines 45-51).

Applicants submit that a view of an active path having an active link that provides access to a function or menu item does not disclose displaying a data set name where a data set name is associated with file components. There is no disclosure in the cited FIGs. 4A and 4B that an active path and active link are a data set name and associated file components. Instead, the cited active path has an active link that provides access to a function or menu item, not file components as claimed.

The cited FIG. 4B, elements 10b-10d, have a root link 101 and hierarchical level 10b. The items 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 are menu items that fall within the same hierarchical level 10b. (Moehrle, col. 4, lines 13-23). Thus, FIG. 4B, like FIG. 4A discusses hierarchical menu items of active links. This does not disclose or mention displaying a data set name and file components associated with the data set name.

The Examiner cited FIGs. 4B and 4C as disclosing the claim requirement of rendering the selected data set name and selected at least one selected file component name in a history panel, wherein the selected data set name and selected at least one file component are displayed in a hierarchical tree arrangement.

As discussed, the cited FIG. 4B shows hierarchical menu items subordinate to a root menu item. (Col. 4, lines 13-23) FIG. 4C is a view of an expanded active path including active links, which as mentioned provide direct access to a function or menu item. (Moehrle, col. 4, lines 24-30). Further, when the user selects an active link 102, the active path responds by executing a function, which may include the launch of software or display of subordinate links

with a detailed description. (Moehrle, col. 5, lines 4-10) The active path 100 enables the user to directly reexecute the last function without the need to navigate. (Moehrle, col. 5, lines 15-20).

Thus, the cited Moehrle discusses displaying hierarchical active links or menu items that are used to execute functions. This does not disclose rendering the selected data set name and a selected file component name in a history panel in a hierarchical tree arrangement. Instead, the cited active links arranged in a hierarchical fashion comprise functions the user may select. The cited links do not comprise a data set name and selected file component name of the selected data set name. Further, there is no disclosure in the cited Moehrle of displaying in a history panel a selected data set name or selected file component name in a hierarchical relationship. In fact, the Examiner has not cited any part of Moehrle that discloses a history panel that displays previously selected active paths or active links in a hierarchical relationship. Instead, the cited Moehrle discusses predefined short-cuts to provide direct access to a given menu item. (Col. 2, lines 52-58)

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claims 1, 11, and 21 are patentable over the cited art because the cited Moehrle does not disclose all the claim requirements.

Claims 2-5, 8-9, 12-14, 22-25, and 28-39 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 11, and 21, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the following dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 2, 12, and 22 depend from claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively, and further require that the data set name is displayed as a parent at a higher hierarchical level to the file components associated with the displayed data set name, wherein the file components are rendered as children in the history panel of the data set with which they are associated.

The Examiner cited FIG. 4B, 10a-102, 101 and col. 3, lines 22-23 of Moehrle with respect to these claims.

The cited FIG. 4B shows menu items that are siblings, where the menu items are active links. Rolling over an active link with a pointer results in the display of siblings and children of the active link. (col. 5, lines 27-31) The active links are functions that may be executed. Nowhere does the cited FIG. 4B disclose that a data set name is displayed as a parent to its associated file components, which are rendered as children in the history panel. Instead, the cited FIG. 4B displays a hierarchical arrangement of active links that may be selected to execute

a function, not a selected data set name and its selected file components as claimed. The cited col. 3 references the detailed description.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that dependent claims 2, 12, and 22 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited Moehrle.

Claims 4, 14, and 24 depend from claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively and further require transmitting a request for file component names of the selected data set name, wherein the displayed file component names comprise file component names returned in response to the transmitted request for file component names.

The Examiner cited col. 9, lines 16-20 as disclosing the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 5) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 9 mentions a data file representing the hierarchical structure of a multi-level hierarchical website is either constructed or retrieved from the server. The data file representing the information hierarchy of the location may be dynamically created from the directory structure and the hypertext markup language (HTML) available on the server and client files.

Although the cited col. 9 mentions retrieving a data file representing a hierarchical structure of a web site, this does not disclose transmitting a request for file components of a selected data set name, where the displayed file component names for the selected data set name are the file component names returned in response to the transmitted request for the file component names. Instead, the cited col. 9 discusses retrieving a data file representing a hierarchical structure of a web site, not file component names associated with a selected data set name.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that dependent claims 4, 14, and 24 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited Moehrle.

Claims 5, 15, and 25 depend from claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively, and further require that the displayed at least one data set name and at least one file component name are displayed in a search panel separate from the history panel displaying the selected data set and/or file component names.

The Examiner cited FIG. 5B as having a history panel, menu item 1.2.4 as a data set name and 1.2.4.4 as a file component name. (Office Action, pg. 5) Applicants traverse.

The cited FIG. 5B shows an active link, such that the children of the active link are displayed in FIG. 5B after a time delay to facilitate the user's sense of orientation. FIG. 5B shows different active links, which provide direct access to a function. Cited elements 1.2.4 and 1.2.4.4 comprise active links that may be selected.

Nowhere does the cited FIG. 5B anywhere disclose showing a history panel and a separate search panel in which a data set name and file component name are displayed, where the history panel displays selected data set and file component names. There is no disclosure in the cited FIG. 5B of different panels, one for displaying data set and file component names, and another history panel for displaying those data set and file component names that were previously selected, as opposed to just being displayed. Instead, the cited FIG. 5B shows active links that provide direct access to a function.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that dependent claims 5, 15, and 25 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not disclosed in the cited Moehrle.

4.   <u>Claims 6, 7, 10, 16, 17, 20, 26, 27, and 30 are Patentable Over the Cited Art</u>

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 7, 10, 16, 17, 20, 26, 27, and 30 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Moehrle in view of Arkhipov (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2005/0114769) Applicants traverse.

These claims are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of the base claims 1, 11, and 21, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above.

<div align="center">Conclusion</div>

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-30 are patentable. Should any additional fees be required beyond those paid, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: January 4, 2008

By:＿＿＿ /David Victor/＿＿＿＿＿＿

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David W. Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: (310) 553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984